

1 JONATHAN PITEL, WSBA #47516  
2 PENNY L. ALLEN, WSBA #18821  
3 SAMANTHA HELLWIG, WSBA #50634  
Counsel for Defendants  
4 1125 Washington St SE  
Olympia, WA 98504-0110

5  
6 The Honorable Tiffany M. Cartwright  
7

8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9 **WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON**  
AT TACOMA

10 PERIDOT TREE WA, INC.,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 WASHINGTON STATE LIQUOR AND  
14 CANNABIS CONTROL BOARD and  
15 WILLIAM LUKELA, in his legal  
capacity as Director of Washington State  
16 Liquor and Cannabis Board,

Defendants.

NO. 3:23-cv-06111-TMC

DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR  
ENTRY OF FINAL ORDER  
PURSUANT TO FRCP 65(A)(2)

**Noting Date: January 26, 2024**  
Without Oral Argument

17 State Defendants request that the Court issue a final order on the merits in this matter, in  
18 light of the Court's recent order denying Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction. In part,  
19 that Order determined that Plaintiff Peridot Tree WA (Peridot) was unlikely to prevail on the  
20 merits as "Peridot cannot use the dormant Commerce Clause to demand a constitutional right to  
21 participate in an illegal interstate market." ECF No. 33 at 19. That Order renders Plaintiff's  
22 claims that Washington's cannabis residency restrictions are unconstitutional invalid as a matter  
23 of law, and resolves the entirety of Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint. ECF No. 27.

24 Prior to the Court's order, the parties fully briefed their legal arguments and submitted  
25 evidence, which this Court considered. The underlying evidentiary record may be admitted  
26 pursuant to FRCP 65(a)(2) at a future trial on the merits and does not need to be repeated. More

1 importantly, the Court’s ruling that the dormant Commerce Clause does not provide Plaintiff  
 2 with a constitutionally protected right to engage in a federally illegal market fully resolves the  
 3 legal issues presented in this matter. As Plaintiff argued, “This case presents a pure question  
 4 of law: does Defendants’ residency requirement violate the dormant Commerce Clause.” ECF  
 5 No. 25 at 9. Now that the Court has resolved that issue, there is little benefit to the parties or  
 6 the Court in prolonging a final ruling on Plaintiff’s claims. Instead, a final order would permit  
 7 Plaintiff to pursue review in the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, if they so choose.

8 Although this Court did not convert Plaintiff’s preliminary injunction motion into a  
 9 trial on the merits pursuant to Rule 65(a)(2), it should do so now. Such a ruling would allow  
 10 the parties and the Court to avoid the time and costs associated with further motions practice  
 11 or litigation—only to have this Court repeat its prior ruling. This approach is consistent with  
 12 the guidance provided by the Ninth Circuit. Under Rule 65(a)(2) the court may consolidate a  
 13 trial on the merits with a preliminary injunction hearing, “before or after beginning the hearing  
 14 on a motion for a preliminary injunction.” A court’s consolidation is reviewed for abuse of  
 15 discretion and “will not be overturned on appeal absent a showing of substantial prejudice in  
 16 the sense that a party was not allowed to present material evidence.” *Michenfelder v. Sumner*,  
 17 860 F.2d 328, 336 (9th Cir. 1988). And where a complaint rests on legal issues or the “central  
 18 challenge” of a complaint and preliminary injunction relates to government agency’s legal  
 19 authority to pursue a course of conduct which requires no additional factual development, a  
 20 final determination on the merits is permitted. *See Slidewaters LLC v. Washington State Dep’t.  
 21 of Lab & Indus.*, 4 F.4<sup>th</sup> 747, 760 (9th Cir. 2021), *cert denied sub nom. Slidewaters LLC v.  
 22 Washington Dep’t of Lab. & Indus.*, 211 L. Ed. 2d 487, 142 S.Ct. 779 (2022).

23 Because the Court’s Order Denying Motion for Preliminary Injunction decides the  
 24 entirely legal “central challenge” in this matter, Defendants respectfully request that this Court  
 25 enter a final order on the merits resolving this matter.

1  
2                   **Word Count Certification**  
3

4                   I certify that this memorandum contains 515 words, in compliance with the Local Civil  
5                   Rules.  
6

DATED this 11th day of January, 2024.

7                   ROBERT W. FERGUSON  
8                   Attorney General  
9

10                    
11                  JONATHAN PITEL, WSBA #47516  
12                  *Assistant Attorney General*  
13                  PENNY L. ALLEN, WSBA #18821  
14                  *Senior Counsel*  
15                  SAMANTHA HELLWIG, WSBA #50634  
16                  *Assistant Attorney General*  
17                  Counsel for Defendants  
18                  1125 Washington St SE  
19                  Olympia, WA 98504-0110  
20                  Phone: (360) 753-2702  
21                  E-mail: Jonathan.Pitel@atg.wa.gov  
22                  PennyL.Allen@atg.wa.gov  
23                  Samantha.hellwig@atg.wa.gov  
24                  LALOlyEF@atg.wa.gov  
25  
26

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Jonathan E. Pitel, hereby certify that on December 11, 2023, I caused the foregoing  
**DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR ENTRY OF FINAL ORDER PURSUANT TO FRCP**  
**65(A)(2)** to be served upon the below listed counsel for Plaintiff:

Via CM/ECF portal:

Jimmy Garg  
300 Lenora Street #1063  
Seattle, WA 98121

Jeffery M. Jensen  
9903 Santa Monica Blvd #890  
Beverly Hills, CA 90212

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct.

DATED this 11th day of December 2023, at Olympia, WA.

*J. H. P. H.*

JONATHAN E. PITEL, WSBA # 47516  
Assistant Attorney General